



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,909	01/10/2001	Sandeep Jaggi	30454-00274 / 99-392	9228

24319 7590 06/03/2003

LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
1621 BARBER LANE
MS D-106, LEGAL DEPARTMENT
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER

BUI, THACH H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,909

Applicant(s)

JAGGI, SANDEEP

Examiner

Thach H Bui

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8-11 and 15-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 8-11, 15-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed April 16, 2003 has been received and entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heckman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,875,431).

As per claim 1, Heckman et al. teach a computer-based accounts payable system comprising a means for receiving an approval for authorizing a particular billing codes having a budget amount stored in the database (see Figures 2) (column 8, line64-column 9, line 5) (column 12, lines 40-45) (column 14, lines 18-22) (column 15, line59-column 16, line 13) (column 18, lines 35-61) (column 20, lines 5-17) (column 21, lines 21-23). Heckman et al. do not explicitly mention a particular billing code is present in a second database comprising a second plurality of billing codes each having a second budget amount. However, Heckman et al. teach multiple databases (17, 21, 72) for storing information and plurality of tasks associated with plurality of billing codes (column 18, lines 35-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the system, as taught by Heckman et al., is capable to store a particular billing code in the second database

Art Unit: 3628

having a budget amount. Also, it would have been obvious to have multiple budgets for multiple tasks.

Furthermore, Heckman et al. do not explicitly mention a particular budget amount associated with a particular billing code in response to a particular billing code matching one and/or none of the other plurality of billing codes. Heckman et al. teach a computer-based account payable system having multiple tasks associated multiple billing codes (as mentioned above) and a cost control system controls the cost targets and monitors budgets. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled artisan in the art to understand that some tasks associated with their billing codes can match one and/or none of the other plurality billing codes.

As per claims 2 and 3, the claims contain features addressed in claim 1, and therefore, are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 4, Heckman et al. do not explicitly mention a means for receiving a selection of a firm associated with the second budget database prior to determining whether the particular billing code is present in the second database. However, Heckman et al. teach a means for selecting a firm (column 4, line 60-column 5, line 33) and plurality of billing codes associates with their tasks stored in multiple databases. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the system, as taught by Heckman et al., has a means for receiving a selection of a firm associated with the second budget database prior to determining whether the particular billing code is present in the second database.

As per claims 8-11, the claims contain features addressed in the above claims and therefore are rejected under the same rationale. Further, Heckman et al. do not explicitly mention a means for authorizing the first and/or second budget amount associated with a particular billing code matching one of the plurality billing codes. However, Heckman et al. teach a means for setting up a budget amount associated with a particular billing code (as mentioned in claim 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled artisan in the art to realize that Heckman et al. teach a means for authorizing the first and/or second budget amount associated with a particular billing code matching one of the plurality billing codes.

3. Claims 15-25 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heckman et al., in view of Giannini (U.S. Patent No. 5,915,241).

As per claims 15-16, 18, 20-22, 24-25 and 30-31, Heckman et al. have all the features of the invention but lack a means for receiving a bill having a billing code, a billing amount and an approved payment of the billing amount. Giannini teaches a means or receiving a bill (electronic spreadsheet) having billing codes associated with the tasks and an approve payments of the billing amount (column 4, line 29-column 5, line 63). It would have been obvious to one skilled artisan in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the billing system of Giannini and combine the teaching of Heckman et al. to have a system having a means for receiving a bill having a billing code, a billing amount and an approved payment of the billing amount. Further, Giannini also teaches a means for approving payment of the billing amount in response

Art Unit: 3628

to the billing amount not exceeding the authorized amount and/or allowable fees (column 8, lines 24-27).

As per claims 17, 19 and 23, both Giannini and Heckman et al. do not explicitly mention a means for checking whether the task has been completed before approving the bill, and a means for generating a communication in response to not approving payment. However, Heckman et al. teach a strategic planning process (see Figure 3) comprising steps of identifying the objectives, and executing the objectives. The system is set up in a way of which a particular billing code is assigned to a specific task when the task is executed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled artisan in the art to understand that the combined system of both Heckman et al. and Giannini has a means for checking whether the task has been completed before approving the bill. Further, it would have been obvious to one skilled artisan in the art to generate a communication in response to not approving payment when the bill is not matching with the authorized amount and/or allowed fees.

4. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Heckman et al., Giannini and further in view of Ensel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,685).

Both Heckman et al. and Giannini teach all the features of the invention but lack a teaching of an electronic bill having a due date. Ensel et al. teach an electronic bill having a due date (column 10, lines 21-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Art Unit: 3628

Heckman et al., Giannini and Ensel et al. to have a system comprising an electronic bill having a due date.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 16, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Heckman et al. teach a computer network comprising multiple databases interconnected for storing information (see Figure 2) and a mean to provide target values (i.e. budgeting) as to timing, costs, and deliverable. Heckman et al. further teach an interactive view (38) of the actual data associated with the completion of the schedule of tasks, the costs, and the deliverables produced is performed. Deviations (i.e. variances) between the target values and the actual values are ascertained (col. 23, lines 16-23). Heckman et al. also includes data having the billing rates, resources, expertise, and legal practice categories of the law firm(s) retained by the client are also incorporated into the strategic plan to the extent that only approved billers may bill against the account, and specific attorneys are identified with the levels of expertise required by the strategic plan (col. 22, lines 51-59). Therefore, it teaches a mean for approval and/or authorization a particular billing code and bills that are associated with the task(s).

Applicant indicated "Heckman et al. do not appear to teach or suggest receiving a selection of a firm". Heckman et al. teach a LexPert system wherein it is in the second part of the DefenseNet computer program. The LexPert is a database

Art Unit: 3628

containing profiles of subscribing law firms and attorneys and etc. that might prove useful in a legal action. LexPert may be connected to a online information service, such as Lexis-Nexis ®, IDEX ® or Dialog ® to provide access to additional information on attorney or other law firms as regards a specific legal issue (col. 15, lines 4-17).

Therefore, it is obvious that Heckman et al. appear to teach a mean to select a law firm pertaining a specific legal issue.

Applicant's arguments have been addressed in the above paragraphs.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thach H Bui whose telephone number is 703-305-0063. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30-4 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung S. Sough, can be reached on 703-308-0505. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

T.B.
June 02, 2003


HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600